

BEST AVAILABLE COPY

Customer No.: 31561
Docket No.: 9289-US-PA
Application No.: 10/065,342

REMARKS**Present Status of the Application**

The non-final Office Action objected the drawings. Claims 3 and 7 are objected to because of informalities. Claims 4 and 5 are rejected because of insufficient antecedent basis. Claims 1, 2 and 4 are rejected under 35 U.S.C 102(b) as being anticipated by Farnworth et al. US patent 6,240,535 (hereinafter "Farnworth"). Claims 5-9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C 102(b) as being anticipated by Crump et al. US patent 5,850,562 (hereinafter "Crump"). Claims 3 is rejected under 35 U.S.C 103(a) as being unpatentable over Farnworth and further in view of Sher et al. US patent 6,154,851 (hereinafter "Sher"). Reconsideration and allowance of those claims are respectfully requested.

Discussion of Drawing Objections

The non-final Office Action objected to drawings. Applicants amended paragraphs [0004] and [0017] to include the reference characters, FIG. 1 S150 and FIG. 2 S240, in compliance with 37 C.F.R. 1.121(b).

Discussion of Claim Objections on Claims 3 and 7

Applicants amended claims 3 and 7 to overcome the objections.

Customer No.: 31561
Docket No.: 9289-US-PA
Application No.: 10/065,342

Discussion of Claim Rejections on Claims 4 and 5

Applicants amended claims 4 and 5 to overcome the rejections.

Discussion of Claim Rejections on Claims 1, 2 and 4 under 35 USC 102

Claims 1, 2 and 4 are rejected under 35 U.S.C 102(b) as being anticipated by Farnworth. Applicants respectfully disagree and traverse the above rejection as set forth below. To anticipate a claim, the reference must disclose, teach, or suggest all limitations of the claim.

In claim 1, address paths to the faulty memory addresses are blocked out. But in Farnworth, a fuse 38 or an anti-fuse 46 is blown by a programming voltage once testing is complete, not to block out faulty memory address. (See column 4 line 67 ~ column 5 lines 5-6).

Claim 1 is not anticipated by Farnworth because Farnworth does not disclose, teach, or suggest all features in claim 1. Independent claim 1 is allowable for at least the reason above.

Because independent claim 1 is allowable over the prior art of record, its dependent claim 2-4 are allowable as a matter of law, for at least the reason that the dependent claims contain all features/elements of their independent claim.

Discussion of Claim Rejections on Claims 5-9 under 35 USC 102

Claims 5-9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C 102(b) as being anticipated by Crump. Applicants respectfully disagree and traverse the above rejection as set forth below.

Customer No.: 31561
Docket No.: 9289-US-PA
Application No.: 10/065,342

In claim 5, the testing/repairing procedure at least includes a step of blocking out an address path to the faulty memory addresses and replacing the faulty memory addresses by standby addresses. In Crump, if any memory failure is found, the POST (power-on self-test) is terminated, and Crump does not disclose, teach or suggest replacing or repairing the faulty memory addresses by standby addresses.

Claim 5 is not anticipated by Crump because Crump does not disclose, teach, or suggest at least above features in claim 5. Independent claim 5 is allowable for at least the reason above.

Because independent claim 5 is allowable over the prior art of record, its dependent claim 6-9 are allowable as a matter of law, for at least the reason that the dependent claims contain all features/elements of their independent claim.

Discussion of Claim Rejection under 35 USC 103(a)

Claims 3 is rejected under 35 U.S.C 103(a) as being unpatentable over Farnworth and further in view of Sher. Applicants respectfully disagree and traverse the above rejection as set forth below.

It is well established at law that, for a proper rejection of a claim under 35 U.S.C. §103 as being obvious based upon a reference, the cited reference must disclose, teach, or suggest, either implicitly or explicitly, all elements/features of the claims at issue.

Claim 3 distinguishes from the combination of Farnworth and Sher because the combination does not disclose, teach, or suggest all features in claim 3. Furthermore, as discussed above, the

Customer No.: 31561
Docket No.: 9289-US-PA
Application No.: 10/065,342

combination didn't disclose, teach or suggest address paths to the faulty memory addresses are blocked out.

So, the combination of Farnworth and Sher does not render claim 3 obvious, and the rejection should be withdrawn.

Prior Art Made of Record

The prior art made of record has been considered, but is not believed to affect the patentability of the presently pending claims.

Customer No.: 31561
Docket No.: 9289-US-PA
Application No.: 10/065,342

CONCLUSION

In light of the foregoing amendments and for at least the reasons set forth above, Applicant respectfully submits that all rejections have been traversed, rendered moot, and/or accommodated, and that the now pending claims 1-9 are in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration and allowance of the present application and all pending claims are hereby courteously requested. If, in the opinion of the Examiner, a telephonic conference would expedite the examination of this matter, the Examiner is invited to call the undersigned attorney.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: May 5, 2005

Belinda Lee
Belinda Lee
Registration No. 46,863

Jianq Chyun Intellectual Property Office
7th Floor-1, No. 100
Roosevelt Road, Section 2
Taipei, 100
Taiwan
Tel: 011-886-2-2369-2800
Fax: 011-886-2-2369-7233
Email: belinda@jciigroup.com.tw
Usa@jciigroup.com.tw

**This Page is Inserted by IFW Indexing and Scanning
Operations and is not part of the Official Record**

BEST AVAILABLE IMAGES

Defective images within this document are accurate representations of the original documents submitted by the applicant.

Defects in the images include but are not limited to the items checked:

- ☐ BLACK BORDERS
- ☐ IMAGE CUT OFF AT TOP, BOTTOM OR SIDES
- ☐ FADED TEXT OR DRAWING
- ☒ BLURRED OR ILLEGIBLE TEXT OR DRAWING
- ☐ SKEWED/SLANTED IMAGES
- ☐ COLOR OR BLACK AND WHITE PHOTOGRAPHS
- ☐ GRAY SCALE DOCUMENTS
- ☒ LINES OR MARKS ON ORIGINAL DOCUMENT
- ☐ REFERENCE(S) OR EXHIBIT(S) SUBMITTED ARE POOR QUALITY
- ☐ OTHER: _____

IMAGES ARE BEST AVAILABLE COPY.

As rescanning these documents will not correct the image problems checked, please do not report these problems to the IFW Image Problem Mailbox.